

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 25, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 14-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24-33 were rejected and claims 2 and 12 were withdrawn from consideration. By this Response, claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 19 and 22 have been amended and claims 26 and 30 have been canceled. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 22 for various informalities.

Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to the claims may be withdrawn in view of the amendments made thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 27, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Dible (US 6,411,490) in view of Nakano (US 20030056901) and Quon (WO 01/95352). The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 25 as allegedly unpatentable over Dible in view of Nakano and Quon, further in view of Zhao (US 5,643,364). The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 7, 14-16, 18, 19, and 22 as unpatentable over Dible in view of Nakano and Quon, and further in view of Reyzelman (US 6,703,080). The Examiner rejected claims 21, 24, 26, and 30 as unpatentable over Dible in view of Nakano and Quon and further in view of Reimer (US 6,817,377). Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 28, 29, 32, and 33 as purportedly unpatentable over Dible in view of Nakano and Quon and further in view of Himori (US 2002/0134508). Each of these rejections is traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited documents, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, the cited documents do not teach or suggest that the first matching unit is located just under the first electrode, the second matching unit is located under the first matching unit, and the first matching unit is arranged closer to the first

electrode than the second matching unit is to the first electrode. This specific arrangement of the matching units and the first electrode results in a structure not taught or suggested by the asserted art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are unobvious, and that each of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Official action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033082.194.**

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: May 24, 2011
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329